

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/341,407	DELOVITCH, TERRY L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ILIA OUSPENSKI	1644	

All Participants:

(1) ILIA OUSPENSKI.

(2) Nathan S. Cassell.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 July 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

rejection of record (05/12/2003) under 35 USC 103(a), and possible enablement issues of claim 1 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph.

Claims discussed:

pending and proposed claims

Prior art documents discussed:

Shehadeh et al. 1994, and Dahlquist et al. 1995 cited in declaration under 37 CFR1.131 by Dr. Terry L. Delovitch on 07/25/2003. Examiner requested that copies of the references be provided to complete the record.

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

possible amendments to the claims to place them in condition for allowance in view of references cited above

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Ilia Ouspenski
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/341,407	Applicant(s) DELOVITCH, TERRY L.	
	Examiner ILIA OUSPENSKI	Art Unit 1644	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ILIA OUSPENSKI. (3) _____.

(2) Nathan S. Cassell. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 August 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 33.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant agreed to amend claim 33 to recite "hamster/human" chimeric antibody.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Ilia Ouspenski
Examiner's signature, if required